

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16 and 18-34 are in the application.

Claims 1, 13, 26, 30, and 33-35 are amended.

Claims 2 and 35 are cancelled.

Applicant proposes, without prejudice or disclaimer, to simplify the issues presented for prosecution and/or appeal, and amend claims 1-16, and 18-33 to recite the essential features of claim 2, that is, the screen resolution is automatically reset, and the prior state stored. Since claim 2 was previously pending, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment does not raise new issues, and would not require new search and/or consideration.

Likewise, the subject matter of claim 35 is incorporated into claim 34.

In reviewing the Examiner's rationale for rejecting claim 2, the examiner cites Matthews page 222, which states simply that the default SIZE of an image is 600 x 64 pixels, and does not address at all the screen resolution and any automated adjustment thereof. Thus, as stated by the Examiner, the size can be automatically adjusted, but this has no impact on the screen resolution. The reason why the screen output is distinguished from the underlying data used to generate the screen output is that the screen display may result from a plurality of applications and/or operating system. A simple example is the overlay of the cursor over the window in a GUI. The cursor might be represented in the screen capture, while not in the underlying data defining the object. It is noted that computer operating systems may alter icon representations, menus, font sizes, etc. based on the selected screen resolution, so that the result of changing screen resolution is not always a simple scaling or interpolation of the output.

In response to applicant's January 25, 2006 proposed amendment, the Examiner suggests that Chailleux, Col. 7, line 60-Col. 9, line 25 and Figs. 3-7, discloses use of a dialog box which allows a user to select a screen resolution.

Without focusing on the merits of this proposed rejection, it is particularly noted that applicants have previously submitted a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 of Joseph K. Orr on January 10, 2005, which supports a date of invention which antedates this reference. Chailleux claims a priority of July 16, 1999, while applicant has presented


evidence of a date of conception no later than November 12, 1998 (see paragraph 6 and Exhibit C). It is therefore respectfully submitted that Chailleux is overcome, and the proposed rejection must fail.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest that a computer display/screen resolution be changed, and indeed teaches that one can simply logically or algorithmically resize the image object, a distinct and contradictory scheme.

Claim 34, as amended (original claim 35), introduces the concept of a "master" page and an "answer" page which seeks to emulate the correct page, the results of which are compared. None of the references teaches or suggests that the systems disclosed therein be used as a query or query-response analysis system. Reconsideration of the rejection thereof is respectfully requested.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Hoffberg
Reg. 33,511

MILDE & HOFFBERG, LLP
10 Bank Street - Suite 460
White Plains, NY 10606
(914) 949-3100